DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 464 687 JC 020 389

AUTHOR	Adams, Julie, Ed.
TITLE	Senate Rostrum: The Newsletter of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, 2002.
INSTITUTION	Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, Sacramento.
PUB DATE	2002-02-00
NOTE	34p.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://www.academicsenate.cc.ca.us.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Serials (022)
JOURNAL CIT	Senate Rostrum: The Newsletter of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges; Feb-Oct 2002
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Standards; *Accreditation (Institutions); Accrediting Agencies; Articulation (Education); Basic Skills; College Faculty; College Outcomes Assessment; *Community Colleges; Cultural Pluralism; *Diversity (Institutional); Institutional Evaluation; School Counselors; Technology; *Transfer Policy; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Academic Senate for California Community Colleges; *California; Intersegmental Coordinating Council CA

ABSTRACT

The 2002 newsletter of Senate Rostrum contains the February and October issues. The February issue covers the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges' January 2002 hearing on Draft A of the proposed new accreditation standards. Members of the Academic Senate attended the meeting in order to voice their concerns regarding the new standards. Senate President Hoke Simpson's article, "'Ignore Us at Your Peril!' The San Francisco Accreditation Hearing," describes Senate members' objections to the Commission's emphasis on quantifiable outcomes rather than educational quality. In addition, Linda Collins outlines the proposal in "The Proposed Accreditation Standards: A Summary Critique." She argues against the revision's aim to import quality assurance approaches from business, and the continuous monitoring of outcomes rather than assuring adequate educational, fiscal, human, and physical resources. Other articles in the newsletter are: (1) "The Lessons of IMPAC" (Kate Clark); (2) "Horse Sense for People--Don't Fence Me In" (Renee Reyes Taylor); (3) "The Disciplines List Hearings" (Scott A. Lukas); (4) "A Report from the Affirmative Action and Cultural Diversity Committee" (Dibakar Barua; (5) "Local Senates" (Kate Clark); (6) "Efforts To Improve Basic Skills in Community Colleges Show Promise" (Mark Snowhite); and (7) "Technology Resources Showcased at Fall Session" (Mark Lieu). The October issue covers valuing diversity among faculty and staff members, the role of local senates in times of crisis, and the status of occupational faculty considering activities of states and vocational education. Other articles included are: (1) "French Fries, Funding, and Student Success: Occasions for Unity" (Hoke Simpson); (2) "Information Competency: Moving Ahead Despite..." (Kate Clark and Dan Crump); (3) "Vocational Faculty--What's Happening?" (Shaaron Vogel); and (4) "The Accountability Game: Stanford 9 in K-12, HMO's in Health Care...MSLO's in CC's" (Leon F. Marzillier). (NB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 464 687

Senate Rostrum:
The Newsletter of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, 2002.

Julie Adams, Editor
February-October 2002

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- ❑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ❑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. M. Silverman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

JC 020 389

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ROSenate trum
Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Newsletter

"Ignore Us At Your Peril!": The San Francisco Accreditation Hearing

by Hoke Simpson, President
Julie Adams, Executive Director

"Ignore us at your peril!" Those were the closing words of Los Angeles Valley Senate President Leon Marzillier during testimony at the Accrediting Commission's hearing on Draft A of the proposed new accreditation standards. The hearing, held on Sunday, January 6th in San Francisco, was the only one to be scheduled in the continental United States.

Besides Marzillier, faculty members testifying were Academic Senate President Hoke Simpson, Past President Linda Collins, Treasurer Ian Walton, and Representative-at-Large Scott Lukas, all from the Academic Senate Executive Committee, and Senate President Ophelia Clark, and Vice President Susan Lopez, both from City College of San Francisco. Also testifying were Jim Perley, representing the American Association of University Professors, and Regina Stanback-Stroud, Past President of the Academic Senate and currently Vice President for Instruction at Skyline College.

All of the participants were in communication with one another prior to the hearing, with the result that the overlap in testimony was minimal. It will surprise no one who attended the Fall Plenary Session, or who has read the resolutions generated there, that those assembled to provide testimony came to persuade the Commission to abandon their misguided emphasis on quantifiable outcomes, and to focus instead on educational quality.

Scott Lukas led off the testimony by calling for an extension of the Commission's timeline for adoption of a new set of standards. Lukas called for the delay in order "to allow for more dialogue [on the standards], for additional hearings to be scheduled, for more time to allow for further written comments to be submitted, and for the commission to adequately share its research with the public." "As a social scientist and researcher," Lukas said, "I can attest to the desirability of sharing one's background materials with their presentation of completed work. Particularly in this case where the adopted standards will impact so many institutions, we feel that it is absolutely necessary that the commission share all background material and data with the public."

Ian Walton testified to his experience as a member of a visiting accreditation team and as standard chair for Governance and Administration during his own college's recent self-study and visitation. "During both of these processes," Walton said, "I observed that for most colleges the current ten-

President's Message | 2
The Lessons of IMPAC | 3
Horse Sense for People—"Don't Fence Me In," 2002 | 4
The Disciplines List Hearings | 5
A Report From the Affirmative Action and Cultural Diversity Committee | 6
Local Senates | 7
Efforts to Improve Basic Skills Instruction in Community Colleges Show Promise | 8
Technology Resources Showcased at Fall Session | 9
The Proposed Accreditation Standards: A Summary Critique | 12

Hoke Simpson

"Where are We, and What are We Doing Here?"

by Hoke Simpson, President

"Where am I?" and "What am I doing here?" is a brace of questions that Executive Committee members ask often, as they wake up in strange—or vaguely familiar—hotel rooms, having departed home turf for YAM (yet another meeting). I recall that my own disorientation was chronic when, as Vice President, I was often traveling four to five times a week. Things are better as President, now I just wake up on cold rainy mornings in Sacramento wishing that the sun would shine.

"Where are we, and what are we doing here?" have become questions of some urgency for our system to answer, for, if we don't, there are others who seem more than willing to answer them for us. And I'm not sure we'll like their answers.

So, where are we? We're here at the beginning of 2002, the largest postsecondary system in the known universe, in a state whose governor seems to be an educational elitist without a clue what the community colleges do, a legislature in which those who do have a clue are quickly being termed out, a Master Plan on the verge of publication, the higher education portion of which is being written, by his own admission, by a staffer named Charles Ratliff,[1] whose history shows him to be enamored of corporate accountability schemes and a "do more with less" mentality, and, oh yes, we're in an economy that's gone South, our base funding's been cut, and more cuts are promised. That's where we are.

What are we doing here? We're struggling, as always, to fulfill our multiple missions: we are trying to be the gateway to higher education for millions of people who, for the most part, need substantial preparation if they are to succeed at our four-year universities; and we are offering vocational education to new and incumbent workers and, through the Economic Development Program, trying to help regional businesses become more competitive. And we're trying to do all this with the lowest per student funding of all the segments of public education—five times lower than UC, and two times lower than CSU.

To help matters along, we are faced with constant criticism from those who think we should be doing more: the Governor and the Legislature think our transfer rates are too low; UC and CSU, now that their facilities and—from their perspective—their funding are impacted (we should have their funding problems), want us to handle the freshmen and sophomores they have no room for; and business people can't seem to decide whether they want entry-level workers to provide a quick fix for their bottom line, or skilled generalists who will be with them for the long haul, so, for them, we are either too slow or too fast. It's little wonder, in the face of all these demands, that we find ourselves a little confused about what we're doing here.

As institutions of higher education, the answer should be simple: we provide quality education, the equivalent of anything students would get in any of the public postsecondary segments. This should be the case, whether the student's goal is transfer or vocational training. The distinction between our transfer and vocational education functions has been blurred, in fact, by the Career Ladders Initiative of our Board of Governors. The blurring occurs in the repeated call for the "integration" of vocational and "academic" education for the traditional vocational education student. What this call acknowledges is that the best vocational training will not only have the specific focus of a vocational area; it will also include a strong component of general education, with exposure to the arts and sciences, to history and language and mathematics, to all those areas that have classically been considered to

Continued on page 15

[1] Mr. Ratliff asserted, at a meeting of the Intersegmental Coordinating Council (ICC) on January 18, 2002, that because the Master Plan workgroups had had little time to attend to higher education (they were almost exclusively concerned with K-12), he would be the author of the higher education portion of the new Plan.

The Lessons of IMPAC

by Kate Clark, Vice President

Kate Clark

Surely by now you've heard about the IMPAC Project (Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulated Curriculum), a project of the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS). Literally hundreds of community college faculty have joined their discipline counterparts from UC and CSU to discuss curriculum, and yes, the A & T words: ARTICULATION AND TRANSFER.

The IMPAC project enables faculty who gather at five regional and one statewide meeting to identify issues associated with transfer, to note trends or external pressures upon the discipline, and to seek innovative and collaborative solutions. The IMPAC project seeks to ensure that students are fully prepared for their transfer into the major and that duplication of coursework is minimized, thereby fostering students' success in the four-year institutions.

Faculty's work this year, however, has been augmented by the inclusion of articulation officers who have been assigned to one of the 16 on-going discussions.* At the regional meetings, these articulation officers note variances among perspectives in the regions, ask pertinent questions about problems associated with prerequisites, and provide information about the articulation process: how articulation is coordinated and agreements crafted; how local requirements can be established; how case management approaches can be instituted.

While remarkable progress is being made, and while faculty are forging professional contacts with their discipline colleagues throughout the state, they have also taken to heart a few lessons themselves. Among those lessons are these:

1. that discipline faculty work in partnership with articulation officers and that their mutual respect enables articulation officers to complete their responsibilities and ensures the academic integrity discipline faculty wish to see institutionalized through articulation;
2. that the work of counseling faculty is too often maligned, particularly by our transfer partners who have little understanding of the professional status of our counselors who have faculty rank;
3. that the instructional wing and student services wing truly do have as their shared goal the educational development of our students and that working in tandem is more efficient than working at odds;
4. that intersegmental problems require intersegmental responses, and the failure of any one entity to participate incurs the enmity of the others;
5. that efforts to articulate courses across the segments can be eased by the common identifying number assigned by the CAN System;
6. that agreements upon courses or major preparation, once articulated, must be readily available to students, faculty, and counseling staff in all segments, on a common data base—ASSIST;
7. finally, that the failure of any one of these supportive mechanisms will impair the ability of the others to function with credibility.

These lessons seem self-evident to those of us in the community college for whom transfer has been a pressing matter. But they have been less evident, perhaps, to my colleagues in my own department, and to our

Continued on page 7

*Disciplines currently under discussion are: chemistry, biology, physics, math, geology, ICS, nursing, agriculture, food science and nutrition, administration of justice, business administration, computer science, geography, engineering, political science, economics

IMPAC

Renee Reyes Tuller

Horse Sense for People—"Don't Fence Me In..." 2002

by Renee Reyes Tuller, Consultation Task Force on Counseling Chair

I have been in love with horses ever since I began riding as a young girl in my small hometown of Reedley, California. I am also a great fan of Monty Roberts, the Horse Whisperer. Roberts' extraordinary work pioneered an entirely new approach to horse training, and if other trainers could be said to be working within the "fenced pastures" of older methods, Roberts' thinking definitely sought out the "open range." Key to his transformative method is the skill of listening and communicating according to the individual needs of each horse. Roberts' new book, *Horse Sense for People*, reveals this and other principles that he developed for communication with and understanding of horses, which could effectively be applied to students needing mentoring and guidance, and more broadly to creating effective educational environments.

The value of applying these principles in the educational arena seems obvious as we encounter more and more demands to justify what we do in terms of quantifiable outcomes. In the face of pressures to consider students as widgets, our thinking is going to have to seek the "open range" if we are to inform them, mentor them, and free them to find that special educational path they each deserve.

The demands for quantity over quality will likely increase unless counselors insist on bringing our knowledge to the conversation. The year 2002 should be the time for counseling faculty to raise awareness regarding the creative approaches needed for our students. Through discussions, both at local campuses and statewide, we can contribute to policy perspectives and underscore the creative and vital role we play in students' success. Monty Roberts offers some ideas with regard to creative mentoring, and his perspectives seem quite apt where policy changes in our education system are being considered. Here are a few of his observations that we need to keep in mind.

"Many people watch, but few see."

Given the nature of our one-on-one access to students we have the opportunity as counseling faculty to share our knowledge of the many obstacles and issues our students face. Within our counseling processes and procedures we have opportunities not afforded classroom faculty who deal with students *en masse*. Counselors come to possess a more holistic picture of the long-term needs of students, as well as each individual student, beyond the classroom. We "see" students and help them in spite of the obstacles with which we contend within our limited resources. As a rule, and not the exception, students attending community colleges must overcome unbelievable odds. Yet, with our help and despite those odds, many persevere semester after semester and achieve their educational goals. Through all of this we try our best to "see" ways in which to help them persevere. In fact, we counselors "see" what many other folks do not. We know how to relate to each student's individual needs and how to avoid "fencing" students into one-size-fits-all solutions.

Quantifiable, "fenced in" outcomes do not accurately measure the quality of the work we do and never will. In this regard, I encourage all of you to be aware of the proposed new accreditation standards. The proposed new standards in Draft A primarily focus on outcomes and pay little attention to the counseling component, suggesting only that all student services be evaluated in terms of quantifiable student learning outcomes. The framers of these standards "watch" but do not "see." The context of the draft seems blind to the needs of our students with regard to the very essence of the one-on-one "seeing" that counselors provide. For example, neither the word "counseling" nor "counselor" appears in this new draft, although the term "advisor"—with its connotation of less-than-professional training—does. This should trigger a red flag to the counseling faculty of the California

Continued on page 16

Counseling Task Force

The Disciplines List Hearings

by Scott A. Lukas, Standards and Practices Committee Chair

Scott A. Lukas

The Disciplines List Hearings are just around the corner! As many of you now know, the review of the proposed changes to the disciplines list is moving along. The disciplines list establishes the minimum qualifications for the faculty of California community colleges. The Academic Senate has the responsibility of making recommendations to the Board of Governors regarding proposed disciplines list changes. The following is provided to give everyone an update on the status of this year's review, what has happened and what will be coming up in the two hearings and Spring Session.

By the time of Fall Session, the Standards and Practices Committee had received over ten disciplines list proposals. At a very lively and well-attended breakout at session, faculty expressed their opinions on the first set of proposals. By the time of the deadline for all revisions, our committee received over thirty proposals. The final list of accepted disciplines list proposals includes thirty-three—the largest number of submissions since the instituting of the process. The proposals represent eighteen different disciplines where recommendations have been made regarding the minimum qualifications of disciplines. Many of these proposals reflect the changes occurring in disciplines across the state and the offering of new programs of study in higher education. Other revisions seek changes in the level and nature of qualifications for disciplines. These particular revisions would require a change of Title 5. Twelve proposals have been submitted to argue for the establishment of new disciplines to the list. For those of you who have not yet had the opportunity to review the proposals, feel free to check them out at the Academic Senate website.

The disciplines list proposals have been sent out to local academic senate presidents, college presidents, chief instructional officers, curriculum committee chairs, personnel officers and representatives of various disciplines organizations. Already our committee has received excellent feedback on the proposals and we would like to thank the many individuals and groups who have taken the time to look over the proposals. In addition to the commentary we have already received, the Standards and Practices Committee relies on the disciplines list hearings to gather testimony on the proposed revisions. This year there were two hearings, one in the North and one in the South. The North hearing was held on Friday, January 25, 2002 in Oakland and the South hearing was held on Friday, February 15, 2002 in Los Angeles. The hearings were intended to provide an opportunity for those concerned with proposed disciplines list changes to comment on the proposals. Comments from the hearings will be summarized and available through the Senate Office. In addition to the commentary provided through direct testimony at the North and South hearings, testimony was also given through E-mail.

Following the hearings the Standards and Practices Committee will compile summaries of the testimony provided for distribution at the March area meetings. Discussion of the disciplines list proposals at the area meetings will provide the Academic Senate further indication of the level of support for the proposals. Based on reaction from the field, the Executive Committee will select those proposals that appear to have significant support for adoption. These proposals will be held for presentation at the Spring Session in April where delegates will vote on them as resolutions. Depending on the result of resolution voting, the Board of Governors will be presented with a first reading of proposed changes to the disciplines list in July 2002.

The disciplines list review is a long but interesting process, highlighting the important responsibilities given to the Academic Senate by AB 1725. As I hope I have made clear, the process also illustrates the real power of consultation and collaboration. The disciplines list review is happening, and I would like to thank the many people throughout the state who have submitted disciplines proposals and to those who have taken the time to provide commentary and suggestions.

Standards and Practices

Dibakar Barua

A Report From the Affirmative Action and Cultural Diversity Committee

by Dibakar Barua, AA/CD Committee Chair

Recently, the addition of new members has brought a new infusion of energy into the AA/CD committee. Just in time, too, because we are revising and updating the 1993 Student Equity handbook entitled "Student Equity: Guidelines for Developing a Plan" for the spring plenary session in April. AA/CD is in the process of discarding unnecessary or old information, adding new materials where needed, updating definitions, adding new and useful materials on campus climate, classroom assessment, learning styles, and academic mentoring, and updating funding sources. One thing we are need is data on exemplary programs to promote student equity. Last year's turnaround survey on Student Equity yielded only thirty or so responses, many of them simply stating that there were no exemplary programs on their campuses. We are going to make one last ditch effort to collect more useful data and send out a follow up memorandum to all colleges. Our aim is to get more information on programs or projects on various campuses that promote student equity in any of the five areas specified by the student equity regulations—namely, access, course completion, ESL and basic skills completion, degree and certificate completion, and transfer rate. We want to collect information on well-planned exemplary programs with proven effectiveness in promoting student success, to give you a more than compendium of all programs initiated in the name of student equity.

To repeat something you all know by now, a recent court action (*Connerly v. State Personnel Board, et al.*) has invalidated many Title 5 regulations aimed at achieving diversity in hiring on the premise that such regulations—especially those asking for district goals or timetables for the hiring of minorities and women—violate constitutional guarantees of equal protection under law. The question now is how do we ensure diversity and equal opportunity in employment, required by both federal and state constitutions and various statutes—for example, Government Code §11135, Assembly Bill 1725, and several sections of the Education Code—without the benefit of most of the instruments and mechanisms so far used by community colleges under Title 5 Regulations. The Chancellor's Office has reiterated its longstanding commitment to equity and diversity, so revisions of Title 5 Regulations are being planned to remove sections rendered problematic by *Connerly* and strengthen equal opportunity and nondiscrimination regulations. The Chancellor has also convened a Task Force on Equity and Diversity to "recommend changes in policy, Board regulations, or state law needed to carry out the system commitment to diversity and student equity," according to the Task Statement. Diversity, in this new context, is "a work force that provides equal employment opportunity to all regardless of race, color, creed, national origin, ancestry, sex, marital status, disability, religious or political affiliation, age, income level, socio-economic status, prior hardship, or sexual orientation."

Diversity in the work force is also a student equity issue. That a diverse faculty and staff would promote equity and success for our very diverse student population is a *prima facie* argument. We want equity and success for all of our students, regardless of their color, creed, gender, or economic status. No reasonable person will deny that California's community colleges, more so than its other segments of higher education, have precisely this mission. California's community colleges are the last best hope, so to speak, for the vast majority of our high school graduates. And we need effective programs to implement various measures for student equity and success—not just good or indifferent Student Equity plans on paper. The Chancellor has stated that the system will enforce minimum conditions regarding student equity plans. That may not go far enough since simply writing a good plan does not ensure that meaningful progress is being made in achieving student equity.

Affirmative Action

Local Senates

by Kate Clark, Vice President

Kate Clark

If you don't know much about the Relations with Local Senates Committee, you soon will. Our members are busy this spring with three projects having direct bearing on your local academic senate.

First, a committee member or an Executive Committee member will be contacting you soon to establish a date to meet on your campus with your senate, your officers, and other interested faculty. We hope to visit each community college campus to learn of your successful ventures and your concerns or local issues. We hope to exchange information—to provide you with alerts and reminders in keeping with adopted resolutions, and to secure from you model documents and data of use to the Academic Senate and its various committees. If you are particularly eager to have someone visit your campus soon and wish more information, please Email the Local Senates Committee Chair and Academic Senate Vice President, Kate Clark at kclark@ivc.cc.ca.us.

Second, the committee is finalizing a revision of a handbook previewed at the Fall 2001 plenary session breakout. That document, much updated and reorganized, will be considered for adoption at this spring plenary session. Watch for the session materials to arrive in March for your preview copy.

Finally, the committee is working with the Academic Senate's office to create a Leadership page, much like other web pages available from the Academic Senate's website at http://www.academicsenate.cc.ca.us. This page will ultimately contain links—internal and external—to materials and resources of particular use to local senate officers. If there are particular features you would to have readily accessible, we welcome your suggestions. Our committee looks forward to meeting each of you in the coming months!

The Lessons of IMPAC

Continued from page 3

fellow faculty in all three segments who teach geology, or business, or computer science, or chemistry, and whose day-to-day preoccupations have seldom been focused on the frustrations associated with the transfer process. For them to suddenly see the benefits of ASSIST, and the need for UC participation in an improved and revised CAN process seem significant lessons indeed—genuine "ah, ha!" moments. Equally significant is the faculty's new appreciation for the work of articulation officers and the complexity of counseling students uncertain about their major or the institution to which they wish to transfer.

These have been the correlative lessons of IMPAC. To learn more about the IMPAC project or to join our efforts, please visit our Web site at http:///www.cal-impac.org. There you will find notes from regional meetings, names and email addresses of faculty and articulation officers who attended, and links to other resources. You may also register there for cost-free attendance at the IMPAC Statewide meeting, April 12-13 at the LAX Sheraton Gateway.

Mark Snowhite

Efforts to Improve Basic Skills Instruction in Community Colleges Show Promise

Mark Snowhite, Chair of Basic Skills Committee

With well over fifty percent of community college entering students assessed as being underprepared to do college-level work in English, mathematics, and/or reading, according to our 1998 Basic Skills Survey, California community colleges face a monumental task of providing effective basic skills instruction. This challenge seems daunting when we consider the degree to which many of these students lack rudimentary skills in reading, writing, and computation—usually after completing high school. With drop-out rates among these students extremely high, how much success can we expect in the future?

Surprisingly, we can expect a great deal of success, but only when our institutions commit to improving basic skills instruction and student success at these levels as a top priority. We already know what practices yield improved results. Both Hunter Boylan, of the National Center for Developmental Education (sponsor of the Kellogg Institute), and Norton Grubb, Chair of UC Berkeley's Community College Cooperative (sponsor of the Basic Skills convocations), have published work and presented workshops describing best practices that have been documented successes and that we can replicate on our local campuses—of course, with the necessary institutional commitment.

And some of our colleges are making impressive progress in basic skills instruction. To get a picture of what practices have been in place in recent years in the our community colleges, the Basic Skills Committee has completed a second comprehensive survey, with a 60 % return to date. This survey reveals what our institutions are doing to help students make critical gains in precollegiate basic skills. With a Board of Governors grant to follow up on this survey, the Senate's Basic Skills Committee—along with a number of college administrators, representatives from the other public higher education segments, a K-12 representative, and research advisors—will use this data and the available information on best practices in basic skills to identify programs in the California community colleges that best achieve student success. This expanded committee will determine ways to use data—some subjective—to demonstrate success in basic skills instruction. We hope to develop data collecting models that might be useful for all colleges to demonstrate the successes of their efforts.

We already have a good idea of best practices. They include having highly integrated instruction and student support services, the use of a variety of instructional approaches, faculty development activities that encourage sharing successful strategies, providing support for part-time faculty and promoting their full integration into instructional approaches, the use of a variety of learning communities, designing curriculum that allows for clear steps of advancement in skills levels, and many more.

We need to increase our efforts in identifying those practices in our colleges and using them as models we can replicate at or adapt to other colleges. We also need to develop better means by which we document our successes. To this end we must maintain control of the design for collecting and using data that help us promote what works. With the Board of Governors grant and the help of bright, dedicated administrators and others from the other systems and segments, the Basic Skills Committee looks forward to a very productive period.

Basic Skills

Technology Resources Showcased at Fall Session

Mark Lieu, Chair Technology Committee

Mark Lieu

At the Fall 2001 Session of the Academic Senate, attendees were given overviews of two important technology resources. Actually, the first of the two, the MERLOT Project, is miscast when categorized as a technology resource because it is first and foremost a teaching resource, which just happens to be available through the Internet. The Multimedia Educational Resources for Learning and Online Teaching, aka MERLOT, was begun at Sonoma State University, hence its viticulturally influenced acronym, and its title explains its function although MERLOT is useful for all educators, not just those teaching online. While there are many teaching resource sites on the Internet, the uniqueness of MERLOT comes from its evaluative function.

Here's how MERLOT works. Anybody can suggest an online resource for inclusion under MERLOT. These resources can be commercial sites or websites created by an individual instructor. The resources are listed under subject areas to facilitate access by teachers. Then comes the important part. Subject area teams made up of educators in the specific discipline work to evaluate the submitted resources using a defined set of criteria established by the project. The peer reviews are rigorous and include specific information as to how the site can be best used, the accuracy of site information, and the overall quality of the site. These evaluations are then added to the resource listing. In addition, users of the resource can add their own comments about each resource. Some teachers have encouraged students to evaluate sites after using them with their classes. When you view resources in MERLOT, whether you use the subject area listings or perform a search, you can specify whether you want evaluated resources to appear first.

The California Community Colleges are just one of 23 participants in the MERLOT Project, which involves institutions of higher education from throughout the country. Ian Walton, ASCCC Treasurer, is on the mathematics team, and his co-presenter at the Fall Session, Michelle Pilati, participates on the physics team. These teams evaluate between 12 and 30 sites per year. I recommend that you visit the site at www.merlot.org for yourself. You may find materials for an upcoming lesson, or you may have a resource you want to suggest for inclusion. If you have questions about MERLOT, you can contact Ian at ian_walton@wvmccd.cc.ca.us and Michelle at mpilati@rh.cc.ca.us.

The California Community College Satellite Network, aka CCCSAT, is appropriately labeled a technology resource. Funded by a TMAPP grant, the goal of CCCSAT is to provide the California Community College System with the infrastructure necessary to take advantage of satellite technology for the delivery of digital information throughout the state. While the current focus is on delivery of television, Project Director Sherilyn Hargraves emphasizes that any type of digital information can be delivered using CCCSAT.

Seventy-one districts in the California Community College System have the equipment in place to downlink from CCCSAT, and more are being added all the time. Districts can download programming that can be telecast in labs or classrooms or over district-run cable channels. CCCSAT was recently awarded a public interest channel on the DISH network, which increases its capability to reach California residents, and provides districts without access to cable channels an alternate way to reach students in their districts. This channel is called the Community College Network (CCN), and its current schedule is primarily programs available over public broadcasting channels. The channel will also be used to publicize the California Community Colleges System and what the System accomplishes for the State of California.

Project Director Hargraves emphasizes, however, that CCCSAT encourages colleges and districts to provide content to CCCSAT for statewide distribution. CCCSAT is not just a way to receive programming, it is also a way to market programs you develop locally throughout the state. For more information about CCCSAT, you can reach Sherilyn Hargraves at shargraves@palomar.edu.

Technology

"Ignore Us At Your Peril!"

continued from page 1

standard process is still a very new experience. It includes two standards (3 and 4) that closely resemble your proposed revisions and their heavy emphasis on so-called quantifiable outcomes. But most colleges have had extreme difficulty meeting those standards or have failed them. And you have no evidence that the very few colleges who have succeeded in meeting those standards are in fact providing a superior education to students as a result.... And yet," Walton continued, "you want to involve us all in a giant leap of faith by making your entire process similar to these two unproven standards. To my logical mathematician's mind that seems close to lunacy. If I were a CEO I think I would be terrified. Why not practice what you preach—and collect some data first, before you leap."

Next to testify was Jim Perley. Perley, a past president of the AAUP and past chair of its Committee on Accreditation, had also challenged the standards as a panel member at the Fall Academic Senate Plenary Session. Perley and AAUP are sufficiently concerned over the Commission's direction that he made the trip from Decatur, Illinois, where he is currently Dean of Arts and Sciences at Millikin University, specifically to testify. Perley said that his concerns centered on academic freedom and shared governance, "areas which have historically been thought to be indicators of quality in higher education.... The emphasis on 'outcomes,'" he said, "rather than process in the new proposed standards is a threat to the exercise of academic freedom which allows excellence to emerge." In his concluding remarks, Perley said that "If new standards for accreditation lead to a perception of the elimination from consideration of structures that have assured...quality, then I, for one, will lobby for a new and different mechanism and structure for achieving accreditation that will insure the maintenance of . high standards of quality."

Linda Collins presented the Commission with a synopsis of her earlier written commentary on the proposed standards. Collins cited the Commission's claim that it has reduced the number of standards to avoid redundancy. "However, upon closer examination, it is noteworthy that the proposed draft is actually quite redundant," she said. "Essentially there is but one overarching standard, repeated over and over again. What is required above all is a 'systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, implementation and re-evaluation to verify effectiveness.' This 'standard' is then expected to be applied across the institution, be it in instruction or student services, administrative processes or governance." Draft A, she said, "completes a retreat from historically understood approaches to standards in two ways. First, the Commission moves away from prior expectations that baseline standards of resources and quality will apply to various areas of the college. However, requiring that colleges meet increasing expectations for productive outcomes without regard for the resources colleges use or need to attain these outcomes creates systemic pressure to cut corners. Second," Collins continued, "the draft avoids any real commitment to or discussion of the levels of achievement expected of students or the educational rigor and integrity of the offerings. It is quite possible to imagine institutions with 'systematic cycles' of evaluation and planning used to enhance 'outcomes' whose offerings are not educationally sound and whose transcripts will not be honored by transfer institutions. In fact, to compel attention to outcomes while removing the underpinning of expected standards in both of these senses is a prescription for disaster in higher education. Focus on quantifiable outcomes without the checks and balances afforded by attention to baseline standards of quality and rigor creates premium conditions for accreditation of and institutional pressures toward diploma mills."

Ophelia Clark, from City College of San Francisco, was also critical of the Commission's lack of attention to essential "inputs," and of its apparent unwillingness to spend time listening to faculty. Her colleague, Susan Lopez, said that "There should be more emphasis on what is known as 'value added.' The student enrolls already possessing (or lacking) certain skills and motivation. How is the student transformed by the process? And what is the process, what is the institution contributing to the equation? Just looking at *outcomes* is not sufficient," Lopez said, "you have to look at the student's starting place, the process and the ending place." Lopez went on to observe that "The standards

"Just looking at outcomes is not sufficient...you have to look at the student's starting place, the process and the ending place."

should speak clearly and eloquently to the reader, but as written, they fail to convey any sense that education is a noble enterprise on the part of the learner and of the educator—on the contrary, the pursuit of knowledge is made to sound completely mundane."

Hoke Simpson told the Commissioners that they should not be surprised that "I am here to make a case for writing the academic senates back into the accreditation standards." The argument, he said, that the standards are necessarily vague about governance because all of the institutions accredited by the commission do not have the same statutory and regulatory requirements as the California Community Colleges, is a weak one. Citing examples of local academic senates' protection of academic quality on their campuses, Simpson said that all colleges would clearly benefit from the requirement that they have a faculty organization entrusted with decisions about curriculum and program quality. Simpson was also critical of the Commission's emphasis on outcomes. Arguing that the principal outcomes of a higher education are the largely intangible changes wrought over the course of an entire lifetime, he said that the best way to tell if a college contributes to producing these positive lifelong results was to look at how it made its decisions—that is, at its governance. "For it is here," he said, "in the ways that people deal with one another, that an institution will model—or fail to model—those traits of personal character that it hopes to effect in its students, and those social and political processes that it hopes to see sustained in the larger society."

Leon Marzillier told the Commission that his academic senate at Los Angeles Valley College was sufficiently concerned by the new standards to pay his way to San Francisco to testify. One focus of their concern, he said, was the language of proposed Standard III concerning faculty evaluation: *Evaluation of faculty also includes effectiveness in producing stated student learning outcomes.* "Depending upon who establishes these so-called 'learning outcomes,'" Marzillier observed, "this could have the exact opposite effect stated at the beginning of Draft A as being the purpose of the commission. 'To assure quality' and 'To promote the ongoing pursuit of excellence.' Instead, the above-proposed language is liable to create institutional pressures toward reduction of rigor, grade inflation, and lowered academic standards." Should the Commission fail to abandon its current course, said Marzillier, "I for one will be joining those at the senate's Fall Session expressing the opinion that as a system, we should simply find another, more responsive body, under which to be accredited. With all due respect," he concluded, "ignore us at your peril!"

Regina Stanback-Stroud told the Commission, "I have to inform you that the standards are bankrupt. There is absolutely no expectation that institutions make any type of resource, service, or scholarship commitment that is generally recognized to insure some measure of academic and educational quality." The abandonment of such expectations, she said, and the shift to an exclusive reliance on outcomes as a measure of quality "is occurring at precisely the time when people who classify themselves as white are no longer in the majority. Now," she said, "the means of certifying quality shifts from the commitment of the institutions to the exclusive performance of the now very diverse student population." Stanback-Stroud continued, "The over reliance on the value based rhetoric of accountability and taxpayers' interest is flawed in that it presumes that the taxpayers who demand accountability are somehow different than the students who attend the community colleges. The community college student as a whole works more than 40 hours per week and pays payroll and income taxes. They live in the community and pay sales taxes. Yes, these taxpayers do demand accountability. They demand to know that when they need to see a counselor they can, that there will be a core of full time faculty to serve them, that the facilities will be decent and suitable for their educational experiences, that the college will have instructional resources to support their learning experience and that the college is stable enough that it will be there by the time they complete their educational goals."

The Commission thanked the participants for their testimony. There were no questions.

In summing up the day's testimony, the AAUP's Jim Perley said that it was "Brutal, but effective!"

"The over reliance on the value based rhetoric of accountability and taxpayers' interest is flawed in that it presumes that the taxpayers who demand accountability are somehow different than the students who attend the community colleges."

Linda Collins

Accreditation Standards

The Proposed Accreditation Standards: A Summary Critique

Linda Collins, Accrediting Commission Liaison

At its recent session, the Academic Senate passed a record number of resolutions concerning the proposed accreditation standards. Other faculty organizations have also gone on record opposing the proposed draft standards, including the Community College Council of the California Federation of Teachers as well as representatives from the American Association of University Professors. The Commission currently intends to adopt a revised draft at their June 2002 meeting.

The Academic Senate has called upon the Commission to extend their timeline and engage in a more inclusive deliberative process. Certainly, the Commission should hold more than one public hearing each in California and Hawaii.

The Academic Senate has also requested that the Commission make available to the public the materials and research upon which they based their extensive proposals.

According to the Commission's "Project Renewal" plan, the revision aims to import quality assurance approaches from business and to address inclusion of the wide variation in institutions now on the higher education "market." But to widen the umbrella in this way essentially reduces the standards to the lowest common denominator.

The content of the standards has been narrowed from the assurance of adequate educational, fiscal, human, physical resources and conditions to the continuous monitoring of outcomes.

The number of standards has been reduced from ten to four; but close reading reveals that these four are restatements of one theme. Essentially, there is but one overarching standard, repeated over and over again. What is required above all is a "systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, implementation and re-evaluation to verify effectiveness." This "standard" is then expected to be applied across the institution, be it in instruction or student services, administrative processes or governance. This approach would inappropriately impose a singular educational philosophy and practice upon all institutions. This represents a radical departure and places the Commission in too partisan a stance in relation to current policy debates about educational reform.

The proposal completes a retreat from historically understood approaches to standards in two ways. First, the Commission moves away from prior expectations that baseline standards of resources and quality will apply to various areas of the college (full-time faculty, basic counseling and library services, adequate or at least tolerable libraries, or sound deliberative processes for ensuring curricular integrity) At precisely the time our students are the most diverse in the history of the region, the Commission would countenance a retreat from an assurance that the minimum resources and standards in instruction and student services are available for them to fulfill their educational dreams.

Second, the draft avoids any real commitment to or discussion of the levels of achievement expected of students or the educational rigor and integrity of the offerings. It is quite possible to imagine institutions with "systematic cycles" of evaluation and planning used to enhance "outcomes" whose offerings are not educationally sound and whose transcripts will not be honored by transfer institutions. Focus on quantifiable outcomes without the checks and balances afforded by attention to baseline standards of quality and rigor creates premium conditions for accreditation of and institutional pressures toward diploma mills. Privileging educational productivity over educational quality risks the academic reputations of the colleges and undermines the credibility of our degrees and certificates in the eyes of transfer institutions and employers alike. This is no service to our students.

Student outcomes measurements are not complete and exclusive measures of quality. The evaluation of institutions should in fact avoid singular measures. As Wellman has noted, "One strength of accreditation historically is that it has avoided one dimensional measures of quality, instead...[institutions must] demonstrate performance in a variety of areas, including curriculum, faculty, finances, governance and student services. Academic freedom, institutional commitment to the public interest, and other important aspects evaluated through the governance standard should not be sidestepped." (J. Wellman, *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Sept. 22, 2000)

The proposed Draft significantly weakens the previous standards with respect to sufficiency of fiscal resources, fiscal stability and fiscal accountability. This is a mistake. The public has a right to expect that accredited institutions are fiscally responsible, stable and with sufficient resources to make it likely the institution will be there long enough to allow students to complete their studies.

The proposed Draft would require that all student development, support services and learning support services be systematically assessed against student learning outcomes. This presumes that one can establish a causal connection between say, a counseling hour, or a visit to the library, and a specified set of learning outcomes. Such an instrumentalist approach to justifying student services appears to presume that students do not have rights to access essential student services, including financial aid advisement, health services, and student access to cultural and social events. While we strongly support program review and assessment of student services, and would agree that all such services should be both relevant to student needs and effective, we do not agree that all colleges should be required to try to prove the efficacy of each service in terms of learning outcomes, as though learning outcomes were the only measurement of a college's function within society.

Much that we do in higher education has long term or longitudinal effects, and could not always be shown to be of immediate efficacy. The approach here is overly simplistic, and could have damaging consequences.

Myriad other new requirements would be imposed including: regular validation of course and program examinations; the identification of competency levels and measurable student learning outcomes for all credit, degrees and certificates, as well as general and vocational education programs. Yet there is no rationale cited to suggest that documentation of this magnitude is necessary and appropriate in all colleges, nor to justify requirements this extensive.

The Draft also calls for evaluation of faculty to include "effectiveness in producing stated student learning outcomes." This particular suggestion is the most likely to exert immediate downward pressure on academic integrity, rigor and standards—especially given the absence in the Draft is any stated commitment to tenure, due process and other central academic norms.

The proposed draft groups all "personnel" together and de-emphasizes distinctions among employees. This reflects a general inattention in the document to faculty, their qualifications, and their role as teachers, mentors and discipline experts. There is a notable absence of any mention of the relational aspects of teaching and learning. Attention to the discipline expertise of faculty is a critical component of ensuring confidence of transfer institutions, and we de-emphasize it at our students' peril.

Of the thirty-four (34) institutions that have undergone the accrediting process in the last several years, only four (4) have satisfactorily met the Commission's expectations with regard to current standards 3 and 4. Yet these, particularly the current standard 3 on institutional effectiveness, really are the "guts" of the new draft proposal.

This should raise flags for all involved. It suggests that the framers of the new standards may be so taken with the outcomes agenda that they are not sufficiently concerned with the very real considerations of cost or practicality. For any college to successfully implement the Commission's new mandates will require significant, sustained and targeted investment in professional researchers, data analysis and computing capability, professional development, and faculty and staff time. This is particularly

"The proposed Draft significantly weakens the previous standards with respect to sufficiency of fiscal resources, fiscal stability and fiscal accountability."

"The ACCJC draft retreats from a commitment to collegial governance."

problematic (especially for the public institutions that ACCJC* serves) at a time when public funding for community colleges has been cut across the region, and we stand on the threshold of major economic downturn.

The diversion of resources on the scale that would be required will by necessity siphon from those places most likely to provide enhanced student achievement: the classrooms, counseling offices, and libraries where faculty and students interact. Prior to embarking on such an expensive and extended experiment, the colleges, the communities we serve, as well as state level policy makers deserve to see a more detailed analysis of the projected costs, impact and implications of this shift in standards for the colleges. Such an approach constitutes a massive unfunded mandate, and will ultimately undermine our shared goal of serving students in the community colleges.

Ironically, while other minimum educational standards are no longer salient, there is one exception. The draft inserts a new, prescriptive emphasis on ensuring baseline resources for technology in teaching. No corresponding plan is required regarding some of the other generally agreed-upon, fundamental resources that support the provision of excellent education such as qualified faculty and staff or sufficient learning resources.

The singling out of technology mediated instruction, particularly absent any evidence that such instruction is good for our students, or enhances their "learning outcomes," suggests that the Commission is working to promote distance education and reorient the standards in favor of institutions (such as Western Governors University, Bob Jones University or the University of Phoenix) that are organized primarily around delivery by distance modality.

Judith Eaton, President of the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA), recently noted that

> *"Six core academic values sustain regional accreditation. They are the valuing of: institutional autonomy, collegiality and shared governance, the intellectual and academic authority of faculty, the degree (whether associate, baccalaureate, professional, masters, or doctorate), general education, and site-based education and a community of learning."* www.chea.org/Research/core-values.cfm

The ACCJC draft retreats from a commitment to collegial governance. This retreat is clearest in the proposed standard on "Leadership and Vested Authority." Gone are the current requirements that faculty have a substantive role in institutional governance, established academic senates and appropriate institutional support. Faculty, staff and students now only need to have a "mechanism or organization" to give "input" on budget, policies and planning.

This overall retreat is particularly problematic in light of the larger agenda in the draft. If colleges are to be organized around the production of student outcomes, then the deliberative processes designed to ensure the integrity of the curriculum and educational programs are even more, not less, critical. They serve as one of the interconnected and necessary checks and balances in colleges and universities. Without sound governance, functional academic senates, and curriculum review processes that ensure the role of discipline expertise, the credibility of our transcripts can and will be challenged by our four year partners.

"Leadership" is not an adequate proxy for governance. The draft also places heightened emphasis on the "vested authority" of the CEOs and governing boards. The general approach to "leadership" appears to be an attempt to reinstate a dated and hierarchical model.

In general, the Academic Senate prefers the more balanced approach to institutional accreditation in the existing standards, and urges a return to multiple measures of educational excellence. While we recognize the current pressures arising from external sources, notably the federal Department of Education, we do not believe that the Commission should adopt unproven, perhaps even faddish measurements and thereby abandon its long-standing commitment to an institution's educational quality evidenced in many ways.

* Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

The Commission has simply gone too far. In attempting to accommodate differences among the institutions accredited by ACCJC, the Commission should not lower generally accepted standards, or simply sink to the lowest common denominator. If accreditation is to be of continued value and viability, it must be credible, and that credibility rests in large measure on a shared belief that accreditation does in fact uphold accepted standards of educational excellence.

The Academic Senate believes this proposal should occasion widespread discussion of the role of the Commission and the accrediting process. The Commission serves the educational community, and a substantive redefinition of the basis of accreditation should not be the Commission's alone to determine.

We urge all faculty to carefully read the new draft and contrast it with the current standards. We urge you to work with your local academic senate and other faculty organizations to organize and express concern about these proposals. We urge you as well to work with classified staff, students, administrators and trustees to raise these concerns with the Commission.

Note: These remarks are drawn a lengthier document submitted to the Commission, available at www.academicsenate.cc.ca.us ACCJC materials can be found at www.accjc.org

Since this article was written, the Accrediting Commission has published Draft B of the Standards. Draft B is available for download at http://www.accjc.org/. The Academic Senate is currently analyzing the new draft, and is sending its liaison Linda Collins to testify at the hearing on March 13th in Hawaii.

President's message

continued from page 2

prepare one to live a rich life and to function effectively in the world.[2] The Career Ladders Initiative, in other words, recognizes that, as Neil Postman tells us in *The End of Education*, the preparation for making a living has always been well served by a good general education.[3]

A quality public education is one which does not serve a public, but which *creates* a public, to cite Postman again.[4] Its goal is the self-actualization of its students, the creation of literate, compassionate people, capable of contributing to a democratic society. As Howard Bowen tells us, the goal of higher education is the development of the whole person, involving the transformation of resources, not into things, but into "desired intangible qualities of human beings."[5]

As obvious as this concept of quality may seem, it appears to be lost on many of the Master Plan staffers and accreditation commissioners of the world, who—perhaps forgetting their own educations—seek to define quality in terms of "measurable outcomes" and the acquisition of "skill sets."

Over the years, my own commitment to our system of community colleges has deepened as I have witnessed, again and again, the dedication of colleagues—vocational and academic—to the "whole person," to enhancing and enriching the potential of students' lives. We can't let ourselves be distracted from or confused about what we are doing here. It's simply too important, and we must keep our conception of quality as the actualization of potential clearly in focus, both for ourselves and our friends and our critics. And with that clarity of focus, we must demand the resources to make the promise of quality a reality.

"As obvious as this concept of quality may seem, it appears to be lost on many of the Master Plan staffers and accreditation commissioners of the world..."

[2] We might note that a plumber who works on pipes and drains is called a "plumber" and is said to have a "vocation"; a plumber who works on the human anatomy is called a "doctor" and is said to have a "profession." As Regina Stanback Stroud has pointed out (Vocational Education Seminar, San Diego, February 8, 2002), our four-year universities are deeply involved in vocational education through their professional schools. And we would add that the need for a good general education is no less pressing for these professionals than for our vocational students.

[3] Postman, Neil, *The End of Education: Redefining the Value of School*, Vintage Books, New York, 1995, p. 32.

[4] *Ibid*, pp. 18, 37, 197.

[5] Bowen, Howard R., *Investment in Learning: The Individual and Social Value of American Higher Education*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1987, pp. 33-36, p. 12.

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

President Bruce Simpson

Publications Committee

Beverly Shaw, Chair
Los Angeles Harbor College

Julie Adams, Editor
Academic Senate

Edgart Aguilar
Mt. San Antonio College

Dibakar Barua
Golden West College

Charles Donaldson
Santa Monica College

Carol Hartman
American River College

Bruce Rogers, Editor
Grossmont College

Design and Layout
Rita Sablas
Publications Specialist

The Rostrum is a publication of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, 910 K Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA 95814.

The Rostrum is distributed to all faculty through college academic senate presidents and by individual mailing.

Letters and unsolicited articles by faculty members are invited. For deadline information call (916) 445-4753 or email us at asrostrum@cc.com

You can find this and the previous issues of this publication online at www.academicsenate.cc.ca.us

Horse Sense for People

Continued from page 4

community colleges. It shows a lack of understanding and acknowledgement of our unique roles and our services to students. Get involved. Learn more from your academic senate on this issue. Let's remain the students. (Please refer to the Academic Senate's commentary on Dorte Vine Jourdeuil on Senate Website: http://www.academicsenate.cc.ca.us.)

"Most of us just [want] to be right and [don't] care if [we're] wrong."

When it comes to the complex issue of increasing transfer and graduation rates, who knows better than counseling faculty what works and what does not for our students? A colleague at CSU-CCC steering committee is involved in the process of developing a draft for a statewide CCC-CSU (TESD) program which will address the goal of assisting and supporting community college students' transfer to and graduation from CSU. Extremely concerned, I sent out the draft, which was placed on the Counseling List Serve, January 2002. It was not put on the Counseling List Serve at the request of Daniel Lundy Williams, the Chancellor's Office staff member coordinating and responsible for the initial draft. I received more specific information on this draft, and I also found out that since (after precedent) I will be advising the draft in progress. Your input is highly appreciated and valued. This is where your professional expertise is essential for our steering committee to represent your ideas and concerns. Together, we can make it easier for our students to succeed, more difficult for them to fail.

"Experience is either dawn's six candles or a cat's way." They either bring assistance, which results in enlightening, or they create confusion and demotivation.

Investing in Excellence was not the first time in our history that we have been asked to increase transfer and success rates. However, now the spotlight is shining brightly on these politically expedient focal points. We keep hearing from our leaders that they really want to increase transfer rates. We keep hearing the public bash us for the absence of accountability, and we have grown to distrust it. Counselors are the first to be blamed when the front line citizens (the state knows that talk is cheap, whereas a college education is not).

What are some of the experiences that have enriched against creating an atmosphere of communication and collaboration in the areas of supporting transfer and student success? For me, one of the most discussions of the 90s have been particularly painful to confront here. Because our salaries fall on the "winning" side of the ledger, we are challenged to "prove our worth" each time we seek replacements or new counseling positions. How is there to be college to provide adequate funding for ASSIST. ASSIST is our backbone tool, yet it is now \$400,000 short of the resources needed to be fully operational. And now, there is the Governor's January budget: CalWORKS cut, \$58 million; \$26.8 million cut from Matriculation; \$5.2 million cut from Faculty and Staff Development; \$10 million cut from the Fund for Student Success; \$29.8 million cut from Telecommunications and Technology Infrastructure; and \$1 million cut from the Nursing Program Expansion. What budget message would you say that sends to community college faculty and to our students? Community colleges have long suffered under discrimination funding with full funding of positions long overdue, and students short changed, and now, as cuts are hitting the home. So, as we seek to be open to new ideas, important transfer and success initiatives, it would be much nicer if the counselors were there to back up their talk. Resources speak to the priorities, and the message to our students, our faculty, and what we do once class primary in California. This hardly sets the stage for communication, collaboration, and creative approaches to student success.

"Trust is [the] first casualty of [the] breakdown of [a] communication [process]."

I propose that what seems obvious, whether for Monty's training methods or our students' success, is to the necessity for creating an optimal educational environment, should also be obvious to our leaders. However, they refuse to "see" and are blind to the obvious when budgets are slashed and programs are imperiled. I look forward to reading what you, our administrators, and legislators are mentioned here about their recognition of what education truly needs, when faculty are truly respected, and when the impossible work we do for our students is valued.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ROSenate Strum

ACADEMIC SENATE FOR CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES NEWSLETTER

Valuing Diversity

by Hoke Simpson, President

I will never forget my interview for the job I still hold, 33 years later, as an instructor of philosophy at Grossmont College. I sat in a room with the president and vice president of the college and, for more than two hours, engaged in a heated discussion about teaching.[1] Employing a variation of McCluhan's "medium is the message," I argued that the principal lesson taught in traditional college classes was that students should sit still and do what they're told, that this lesson was the same no matter what the nominal subject matter of the course, and that the primary function of college, therefore, was that of quashing any tendencies to uniqueness and turning out docile citizens who would dependably function within a limited range of social normalcy. Whatever I did in my classes, I assured them, would be designed to undermine and subvert this oppressive tradition. My students might or might not learn much about philosophy, but they would sure as hell learn what college was designed to do to them, and they'd learn a great deal about how to fight it. My interlocutors argued, with equal vehemence, that my attitude was irresponsible both to my discipline and my students.

They hired me the next day.

For the next few years, I engaged in what might be generously characterized as "cutting-edge, experimental, non-directive" teaching, until it gradually dawned on me (1) that what my students were learning seemed to be that my classes were an easy 'A' if only they were willing to show up and emote, and (2) that my own traditional education had not left me feeling or acting particularly oppressed. (I know, we might argue that it was precisely that oppressive tradition that was the cause of my slow epiphany—but to go there would only prove, again, that the intellect can be a tool of masochism.) My teaching, as a result, eventually worked its way to within the bounds of the normal. In the meantime, the senior members of my department, to their credit, protected me from subsequent administrations, less sympathetic to my need to experiment.

It was not until 11 or 12 years later that I was asked to serve on a hiring committee myself, and was first exposed to the system that is still with us today. The hire was in the department of Computer Science and Information Systems, in which I was, by then, teaching part of my full-time load. Because of my peripheral role in the department, I was not involved in the paper screening or in the preparation of the interview questions, but was only asked to participate in the interviews themselves. Prior to the first interview, committee members were handed a sheet of prepared questions, it was decided who would read which of them to the candidates, and the interviews began. I found the process appalling. Both interviewers and interviewees were stripped of their humanity and required to engage in a stilted simulacrum of communication. It was as though authenticity had been banned from the room. No one in this process was encouraged to be themselves: the interviewers were required to be

CONTINUED ON PAGE 3

Valuing Diversity 1

French Fries, Funding, and Student Success: Occasions for Unity ... 2

Information Competency: Moving Ahead Despite 3

If I Have to Explain, You Wouldn't Understand..... 6

Vigilance and Self-Defense: The Local Senate's Response to Crisis. 10

Vocational Faculty—What's Happening? 12

Local Senates 13

The Accountability Game 14

[1] I had already met with the faculty, the "interview" lasted ten minutes. My first year was to be as a sabbatical leave replacement, and they had clearly already determined to offer me the job based on my recommendations from graduate school.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Hoke Simpson

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

French Fries, Funding, and Student Success: Occasions for Unity

by Hoke Simpson, President

As I write this, I'm sitting in the Roadhouse Café in LAX, Terminal 7, with a two-hour wait for a connecting flight. I was here a few weeks ago with Executive Director Julie Adams for a pause of similar proportions; we got a lot of work done (see accompanying photo), but, as importantly, we both noticed what a pleasant place it was to wait. The Roadhouse has a sign on the outside window, "Last Chance for Good Eats" (a believable enough claim as you're about to board an airplane), it has a Route 66 theme on the inside, and it seems to be a family enterprise—run by a very functional family. Everyone working here is upbeat, they treat one another with care and respect, and they are very solicitous of their customers. My order of french fries (excellent—real potatoes) was greeted with as much enthusiasm as my steak and scampi order at the Palm Springs Doral last night (a meeting of the occupational deans, who don't fool around about their meeting sites). The world needs places like this, places where being there is easy. Sure, we need challenge, danger and excitement, too; but just coming into an airport these days reminds us that there's more than enough of that, and that it's the peace and tranquility and the welcoming atmosphere that require the work.

Our community college system seems to me to be behaving more like a functional family than it has in the past, a trend that can only bode well for our students. There are several opportunities for faculty to contribute to that trend this year, and I want to urge you to take advantage of them.

First, there are, as always, issues of funding. I have heard from all over the state that campus constituencies have been working together toward the passage of Proposition 47, as well as, in many cases, for local facilities bond issues. We are all hoping for a big payoff on November 5th, and a much-needed renaissance in our facilities.

I also hope that academic senates are working with their administrations, staff and students on our voter registration and student mobilization campaign, designed to bring our 2.6 million students into the political process to lobby in their own interest on community college issues, with funding at the forefront of these. This is a project that needn't—in fact, shouldn't—end on November 5th, for the aim is not a vote on a particular measure, but ongoing contact with legislators and the Governor to create the political will to address the disparate funding of the public higher education segments. If we can successfully get this effort off the ground, we can, in the future, look to more sophisticated and more focused ways to employ community college "voter power." In the meantime, we have the opportunity to bring all our constituen-

CONTINUED ON PAGE 8

Academic Senate Executive Director, Julie Adams at the Roadhouse Café in LAX

Information Competency: Moving Ahead Despite ...

by Kate Clark and Dan Crump

At its September 2002 meeting, the Board of Governors was poised to adopt a new graduation requirement for all California community college students. This new requirement for information competency, employing the definition of information competency adopted by the Academic Senate, would indicate to transfer institutions and to employers that our students had the ability to recognize the need for information and to find, evaluate, use, and communicate information in all its various formats. It combines aspects of library literacy, research methods and technological literacy. Information competency includes consideration of the ethical and legal implications of information use and requires the application of both critical thinking and communication skills. [Proposed Revisions to Title 5, Chapter 6, Subchapter 10, Section 55601]

However, just days before the Board was to approve this requirement, the Department of Finance (DOF) declared that a review of graduation requirements would present an "unfunded mandate" to districts; thus, the DOF informed the Board that it was not to adopt this new requirement and that moving ahead to consider it at that time would be illegal.

This frustrating development, a clear intrusion into the right of the system to make its own determinations about educational programs, requirements, and quality, is a source of ongoing discussion throughout the state. The Board, the Chancellor, the Consultation Council, and community college faculty supported this new requirement and had tacitly understood that any attendant "costs" would be borne by local colleges or districts in an effort to improve the educational experiences of all our students.

This procedural setback, however, has not dampened faculty's enthusiasm for this requirement. Because local districts remain free to adopt this graduation requirement independent of Board action, colleges, led by their faculty and especially their curriculum committees, continue to press forward in identifying how the local curriculum can best meet the local needs of students and the community by introducing information competency. Prompted perhaps by the once-pending adoption of such a requirement, faculty, deans, and other administrators across the state have launched their own spirited discussions.

The Academic Senate will present for adoption at the Fall 2002 Plenary Session, a second paper in what will no doubt be a series of documents published to support these efforts to institute local information competency requirements. This new document demonstrates how six colleges (Diablo Valley, Glendale, Cabrillo, Cuyamaca, Santa Rosa, and Merced) have gone about making and implementing their local decisions. Often beginning with the definition of information competency adopted by the Academic Senate, these faculty fostered a college-wide discussion by asking such questions as these: What courses currently offered address information competency? What sort of additional courses might be offered? How might the components of information competency be integrated into existing courses?

We urge local senate presidents to share the draft document widely (available electronically at http://www.academicsenate.cc.ca.us) and solicit faculty comment prior to session; presuming the paper's adoption in October, we then hope that the final publication of this informative paper in hard copy and on the Academic Senate website will further stimulate your own local innovation.

In support of resolutions adopted in Spring 2001 and Fall 2001, the Academic Senate also urges faculty to consider how such an information competency requirement might be applied to vocational and technical programs, especially to certificate programs of 18 units or more. At the 2002 Fall Plenary Session, the Curriculum Committee and the Occupational Education Committees will jointly sponsor a breakout on this very topic to explore with faculty the relevance of such competencies to these areas of study. We invite you to join these discussions.

Kate Clark

INFORMATION COMPETENCY

Valuing Diversity

"neutral" in their responses; and the candidates were required to pour themselves into the mold constituted by the predictable, insipid, systematically inoffensive questions.

The top finalist was, of course, predictable, insipid, and systematically inoffensive (until she was hired). The best candidate, in my view, was one who was least able to contain herself within this process; she kept verging on breaking out and being herself. In this context, though, she was perceived as "weird" and slightly dangerous—which, of course, she was. Each flash of authenticity threatened to explode the process, to reflect it back on itself and reduce it to a heap of embarrassed rubble.

The interviews completed, I went to the dean and expressed my dismay at what had come to pass in our hiring procedures. The contrast, I pointed out, between this recent, Kafkaesque experience and my own hiring interview could not have been more stark. The people interviewing me wanted to know who I was, and genuinely encouraged me to show them what I was made of. And they, in turn, did not hesitate to convey to me their own deeply held convictions. The result was an impassioned dialogue that left me feeling that this place was one where I truly wanted to work. I could not imagine a candidate feeling that way about our college as the result of the interviews we had just conducted. In fact, if I wanted to communicate that our college was a haven for those who were most comfortable when repressing their humanity, seeking others equally at ease with a denial of their personhood—a community, in other words, of crazy people—I could find no better way to do it than through the process we had just engaged in.

That meeting with the dean was the beginning of what has been a 20-year effort to inject humanity into a process that has become the norm in the California Community College system. I am now convinced that the effort should be abandoned, and with it the process itself.

What has brought me to this point is a series of reflections on the "crisis" in our hiring policy brought about by the Third Appellate Court ruling on Proposition 209 in the Connerly case. By striking down the statutes and regulations governing affirmative action, the court is seen to have struck a blow to efforts to achieve diversity within the community colleges, and to have presented us with the challenge of achieving diversity through other means. To accept that challenge is to seek to identify the obstacles to achieving diversity, and then to find ways to overcome them.

Whatever else Ward Connerly and Proposition 209 have done, they have not robbed us of the tools sufficient to achieving our goal. That much at least is clear from the dismal record of our progress. If we are going to think anew about how to diversify our faculty and staff, then, we need to move beyond the desire for new regulations to replace those struck down, and begin with the as yet unanswered questions: What has kept us from getting there so far? and, once the obstacles are identified, How do we overcome them?

One obvious place to look for the impediments to diversity is at the attitudes of those serving on the hiring committees. Are they pro or con, actively seeking to hire diverse candidates, or actively—or passively—resisting? My own experience on hiring committees in my district suggests that this is a genuine source of our problems. And my experience as a human being living in America also suggests that these attitudes are heartbreakingly difficult to change. We must continue to try, and we must eventually succeed if we are to succeed as a civilized nation; but we cannot hang our hopes of achieving diversity in our ranks in the short term on changing peoples' hearts.

We can, however, change the process which seems as though it were designed, however unconsciously, to give comfort to the opponents of diversity and to silence its advocates. The process I have described above, the one we have all employed for decades and which we take for granted in all of our discussions, is one which does just that. I have no doubt that the process was designed by well-intentioned people to promote fairness and to eliminate bias and cronyism in hiring. The process is fatally flawed where diversity is concerned, however, for it identifies "fairness" with "uniformity" or sameness, whereas to celebrate diversity is to embrace variety or difference. From the interviewer's perspective, even those who might champion diversity are shut down, for this process allows no championing, no overt encouragement nor overt challenge. From the candidate's perspective, we must recognize that in hiring procedures the medium truly is the message, and our process screams "No variety wanted here!"

So, if we abandon our current way of doing things, identifying it accurately as a major obstacle to the achievement of diversity, what do we do instead? We invite candidates to lunch or to dinner, we sit down with them and engage them in serious discussion, we challenge them to show us what they're

DIVERSITY

really about, and we let them see who we are as well. And, sure, we have them teach a real class of real students—and we don't worry that they aren't the same students for each candidate or that each candidate might teach a different topic. In short we treat candidates and ourselves like human beings interested in discovering if they want to be one another's colleagues for the next thirty years.[2]

But how can we guarantee fairness in such circumstances or, beyond that, ensure that we don't just choose as colleagues those who are most like ourselves? Short of absolute guarantees, we can, in fact, do a great many things to promote fairness and the championing of diversity. We can ask that every academic senate form a committee on hiring and diversity, and that this committee establish, with the full support of the administration, a training program for all members of hiring committees. We can ask that such programs seek, in the words of a recently adopted Academic Senate paper, to

- convey a sense of the educational, vocational, and social value to students and the campus community of a rich variety of backgrounds and perspectives among its members;
- reduce trainees' fear of, and induce a positive appreciation of, cultural differences;
- communicate clearly that discrimination based on cultural and racial difference is wrong, and illustrate the damage—social, socioeconomic, and psychological—that has occurred as a result of discriminatory practices;
- communicate the importance of campuses becoming cultural models for students: that, by providing an environment which honors diversity and is free of prejudice, the college can produce in students attitudes that will contribute to the elimination of bigotry in the larger community;
- provide trainees with specific strategies and techniques for promoting inclusiveness in job descriptions, advertising, paper screening, and interviews, as well as eliminating unintended exclusiveness; [and]
- persuade trainees that good hiring practice demands reaching the broadest pool of potential candidates and hiring the candidate who will be the greatest asset to students and the campus community.[3]

We can ask, as some colleges already do, that no one be permitted to serve on a hiring committee unless they have undergone training, and that there be a requirement that all potential committee members be "re-certified" on a regular basis. And we can ensure adherence to this policy by having the academic senate make all appointments to hiring committees in consultation with discipline faculty. Our aim would be, in part, that those who are frightened by their own humanity, who, that is, are afraid of difference, would either get over it or self-select themselves out of what they perceived as an onerous process.

We can charge academic senates with the development and oversight of part-time hiring policies that ensure the same level of professional consideration as is accorded to full-time hires.

We can ask academic senates to take the lead in initiating and sustaining internship programs, such as the SDICCCA program in San Diego.

I am not suggesting for a moment that the process under which I was hired 33 years ago be taken for a model. In fact, in almost everything but the interview, that process was deeply flawed. We have indeed come a long way since then in terms of our awareness of the value of diversity and of the factors that contribute to our achieving a more diverse faculty. But we have also made some mistakes, mistakes that I believe impede the achievement of our goal.

In conclusion, the Third Appellate Court ruling did not revoke section 87360 (b) of the California Education Code, the section that makes faculty hiring policies the product of joint agreement between academic senates and their governing boards. Those policies must now be reconstituted in the light of the Connerly decision. I am suggesting that academic senates must take responsibility for realizing the value of diversity in their own ranks, and that this might best be accomplished by first removing the straitjacket that identifies fairness with uniformity, and replacing it with an open process that permits diverse candidates and the champions of diversity among the faculty to affirm the value of human variety and difference.

[2] As far as I have been able to determine, there are no legal obstacles to such an "opening up" of our interview procedures. In fact, interviews in the UC system appear to be conducted in much the fashion that I have described. The rigidity of our own procedures seems to be grounded primarily in a fear of lawsuits.

[3] A Re-examination of Faculty Hiring Processes and Procedures. Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, adopted Fall 2000.

DIVERSITY

Renee Reyes Tuller

COUNSELING ISSUES

If I Have to Explain, You Wouldn't Understand

by Renee Reyes Tuller, Counseling and Library Faculty Issues Committee Chair

There is a saying in the biker world (I mean the Harley Davidson world) that seems apropos to our state of affairs on the front line as community college counseling faculty.

That saying is: 'If I have to explain, you wouldn't understand." What do I mean and how does it relate to riding a Harley Davidson motorcycle?

Well, my husband opened my eyes to the biker world—the love of the outdoors, and the "feeling" of freedom in riding on the open road. The beauty of that "feeling" makes everything else seem insignificant. It is meditation on wheels—words just cannot explain this "feeling" better. Bikers have a hard time explaining "that feeling" to folks who don't understand "that." In other words, if a biker gets into a situation when there is a need to explain "it", then you just wouldn't understand "it". There is a deep connection of bikers to bikers since within that subculture there is no need for explanation; they share that mutual appreciation for that freedom of riding. No words need to be spoken, no justifications for the choices made. There is an "us" reality, and for those that don't understand, a "them" reality.

In the last 20 months as your South Representative for the Academic Senate, I have had the opportunity to realize how this "us and them" phenomenon in the biker world is oh so similar and prominent in the educational world within the California community colleges. When I get around "them," I realize how absolutely complicated it is to explain the frontline truth that in the counseling "us" world we know so well as faculty. "They" want us to explain why our transfer numbers to CSU and UC are not rising more steadily. "They" want "us" to explain why we need retirement positions replaced with another full-time counseling position. "They" want "us" to explain why we need new positions to accommodate the growth happening at so many community colleges in the state. Counseling faculty are consistently put on the defensive unlike other faculty on campus. The reality for many counseling faculty is "If we have to explain, we know you won't understand." For the sake of this article, I am going to try to explain.

"We" are the faculty on the front line who are counseling and educating the most diverse students on the planet in the largest educational system in the world. We must wear a number of hats in accomplishing this mission and adapt quickly to the ever changing needs of our students. In a nutshell, we are our students' advocates, teachers, mentors, healers, tutors, parents, sisters, brothers, holistic guides, diplomats, cheerleaders, academic and personal coaches, friends, politicians, and drill sergeants. We are the lucky ones to witness first hand the enormous changes our students go through to attend class, to achieve simple goals, to transfer, and overcome unbelievable odds. We feel our students' journey as we guide them like sherpas up the Himalayan mountains. We feel their pain, we rejoice in their victories—however small or large. We provide the ingredients that will never be explained through numbers and statistics that are so heavily relied upon by "them" in measuring our success. We are that powerful a force in many of our students' lives. We know that.

As counseling faculty we also know that many of our colleagues and administrators on our own campuses do not fully recognize, understand, acknowledge or value what we really do. Recently, I heard a story of a college president who walked into the counseling department and saw the hordes of students waiting in the lobby. The president asked a counselor, "What are all these students doing here?" The counselor said, "It's fall registration. This is our busiest time." That seems trivial, but to have a college president not understand this, shows the lack of understanding about what we do.

With $22 million dollars cut from matriculation, $30 million cut from CalWORKs, and all

of the $5.2 million Staff Development monies eliminated, the target of the cuts show an obvious attack on where we are most vulnerable—student services, specifically counseling. I have asked my colleagues across the state—at conferences and on the counseling listserve—"How are the budget cuts affecting your college?" Many counseling faculty responded to that question. Here are just a few responses.

At one college, all adjunct counseling resources have been eliminated. At another college, all counseling positions have been frozen. At a number of colleges, since all staff development money is gone, there will be no college conference money for counselors to attend the counselor training conferences at UC and CSU. At another college, the Learning Disabled students will no longer have tutoring. Many CalWORKs programs are eliminated or will have a skeleton crew to transition the CalWORKs students to other programs. At one college, there was a reduction to their counseling contracts for seven counselors that were moved from 215 days to 195 days, a 20-day reduction. The total savings was $38,943 and the loss to students was over 4,000 student contacts. This same college asked counselors to return to work for reduced pay. Several counselors chose take the lower rate of pay to protect their jobs. They were told there wasn't any money, and then more money was found. One college simply slashed 38% out of the counseling department. Some colleges are consolidating positions, eliminating others and downsizing support staff. Another counselor mentioned the issue of "college starter" programs, whereby the K through 12 students can attend the community college—yet the state is not funding such programs. Instead the state is slashing the budget and allowing the youngsters access to community college education.

These are only a handful of examples of the fallout counseling faculty are seeing as the budget knife has cut into the heart of counseling and student services. Many counseling faculty are trying to do the best they can with the set of cuts that have hit them and to see as many students as possible. However, the consensus is "we" know our students are being hurt. This is happening at a time when our colleges, "they," are asking "us" counseling faculty

- *Why our transfer numbers are not rising more steadily.*
- *Why we cannot open for longer hours and on the weekends.*
- *Why we cannot start an online, web advising program.*
- *Why we cannot start an ambassador program.*
- *Why we cannot do more outreach with less release time.*
- *Why we cannot offer more classes.*
- *Why specialists cannot be in different department areas.*
- *Why we cannot be more involved on committees.*
- *Why we cannot see more students in less time.*
- *Why we cannot provide more career counseling workshops, transfer workshops, probation workshops, time management, stress management and life skills workshops.*

"They" want "us" to explain why we can't do more with less. "They" want more transfer numbers, more graduation numbers, more outreach numbers, more application numbers, more FAFSA numbers. The goal is to have more, more, bigger and more impressive numbers to display and revel in.

How do we get those larger numbers? Outcomes, Student Learning Outcomes is the current mantra in the planning circles that are humming the answer to our prayers, saying outcomes over and over again. "Outcomes"—we are now expected to go along the "outcome" path to la la land without truly questioning the legitimacy of what that really means. What does that mean for counseling faculty? Just what are we doing and for what reason? Is our success solely dependent on bigger numbers? What about our students?

These are really bad budget times. We all know that. The one thing that seems clear to me is that as colleges struggle to adapt to the budget

COUNSELING ISSUES

cuts, something has to go. That something comes down to either we reduce access, or we reduce services or quality of services to our students. There are going to be consequences for either path. Since most colleges will not consider reducing access, what option does that leave?

It is unmistakable in these economic times that "we" counseling and library faculty fall on the 50% law's dark side of the ledger. As long as we are not considered faculty on the other side of the 50% law, we are open targets. The matriculation cuts have hit deeply into of many of our counseling departments and Transfer Centers. How can we continue to give our students less than they deserve? As long as "we" are on the dark side of the 50% law, we will be treated differently than other faculty. "We" are vulnerable and the Academic Senate has adopted resolutions in support of our position on the issue. (See below.)

So one way to move beyond "us" and "them" is to stay current with the issues we are dealing with in the state. We must work together as a united counseling faculty and bring our insight and expertise to the table. Get involved on a local level. I urge you to become involved with your local academic senate and your unions. It is up to "us" to attempt to bridge the gap of understanding with "them." Our students depend on us. We know that.

*(If you would like to be on the counseling listserve, please e-mail Renee Tuller reneetuller@cox.net)

French Fries, Funding, and Student Success

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 2

cies together in the shared recognition that we need a stronger political base if we are ever to solve our most enduring problems.

Finally, a major occasion for working together presents itself this year in the areas of equity

COUNSELING ISSUES

RESOLUTIONS RELATED TO

Fall 1999

REAFFIRM its previous position that counselors, librarians, and other faculty whose assignment may not be primarily in the classroom are faculty.

Spring, 2001

WORK to amend California Education Code 84362(b)(1) and (d) to include the salaries of "counseling and library faculty";
WORK to amend California Education Code 84362 (d) such that the minimum percentage of any district's apportionment spent on classroom, library, and counseling faculty salaries increases from the present standard of fifty percent to a percentage that is commensurate with the inclusion of counseling and library faculty members;
and REAFFIRM the importance of establishing a statutory minimum percentage of instructional expenditure by districts and the value that such a criterion has in protecting the academic standards and central importance of instruction in the California Community Colleges.

and diversity. The Chancellor's Office Task Force on Equity and Diversity, formed in response to the *Connerly v. State Personnel Board* decision, will soon be issuing its report, in which it will propose that we achieve our long-held goals by assigning primary responsibility and timelines for each goal to different system constituencies, and by getting a public commitment from each constituency that it will meet its objectives. For virtually every goal, there is the recommendation that the responsible group coordinate its activities with one or more other constituencies. In other words, there is the recognition that we are all going to have to make progress together if we are going to make progress at all.

In the area of student equity, for example, the Academic Senate is assigned responsibility for updating the document *Student Equity: Guidelines for Developing a Plan* by October, 2002 (we've met that deadline), and the CEOs are charged with adopting updated student equity plans by March 2004, in coordination with all other district and college constituencies. We have, for years, bemoaned the fact that the original Board mandate to create these plans did not require regular updates or serious implementation, and have called for that to change (Resolution 6.01 F00). With the Task Force Report and the focus of the Board of Governors on the implementation of the report's recommendations, we now have an opportunity to work collaboratively to make revitalized plans and effective student equity strategies a reality in every district.

As delineated in the Student Equity: Guidelines document, a key ingredient in any plan will be a campus climate study, and the document proposes the sorts of research that can go into that. While we are exercising our collaborative skills, and thus making progress toward becoming a more functional community college family, let me suggest an addition to the research proposed on campus climates: Be sure to include a field trip to the Roadhouse Café.

Spring 2001

URGE the Chancellor to protect counseling faculty and library faculty form unwanted attacks and work with the appropriate associations in gathering data and developing a survey to assess the impact of the 50% law on student success, and WORK with the Chancellor on re-convening the 50% law task force to review and study the data and to consider whether to recommend amendments to the 50% law (such as substantially increasing the percentage to include counseling and library faculty).

Spring 2002

OPPOSE the layoff of any counseling faculty as a result of matriculation budget cuts.

COUNSELING FACULTY

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Kate Clark

Vigilance and Self-Defense: The Local Senate's Response to Crisis[1]

by Kate Clark, Vice President

From time to time, every local senate finds itself in the midst of crises—internal or organizational, at the college or within the district, lasting or transitory. Based on the experiences some senates have endured, we offer these suggestions for your consideration—and for wider debate and discussion. What follows, then are thoughts about the collective responsibilities of local senate members and advice particularly suited for local senate presidents and officers—whether in crisis or not.

ROLES OF LOCAL SENATES IN TIMES OF CRISIS

Local senates must remain aware of changes in local or state regulation or in statute that impinge upon our duties—and upon those with whom we share governance roles. As a personal observation, I recommend that local senates consider retaining separate counsel familiar with education law and that they establish separate, legal defense funds independent of college funding mechanisms. This resource, in time of happy, conciliatory relationships, affirms our contentions and keeps us abreast of pending legislative or regulatory threats; in times of crisis, such counsel assumes duties and does not compel harried faculty to become masters of legal code, writs of mandate, formal grievances or other implements of legal recourse. By distributing the responsibility for vigilance, legal resources can ensure our informed participation.

Local senates must also confront moral and legal infringements upon shared governance in their institutions. Full participation should always be assumed, but never left unquestioned by the senate. Resistance need not be confrontational, but it should never be oblique; it must be clearly articulated and visible to all in the college community. The ability of tenured faculty to oppose injustice without reprisal often obligates them to do so on behalf of others, particularly untenured faculty, the staff and students who are or who feel most vulnerable.

Local senates must never be complacent about their roles in educating and re-educating boards, new administrators, and new faculty. Senates need to present to these groups well-organized orientations that outline senate authority and the past practices that distinguish one campus from another. This need is particularly true of the smaller siblings of multi-college districts: board members and district administrators need information to compensate for the sometimes louder voice of the larger siblings; college administrators need such data and clarity if they are to advocate confidently for their institution.

With due diligence, the local senates *must* carry out their statutory responsibilities—and seek appropriate support for these governance tasks. At the same time, we must be prudent, respecting and reinforcing the delegated authorities of other bodies: the faculty bargaining unit, the classified senates, administrators' councils, and student government. Publicly supporting their work and resisting outside efforts to pit us against one another ensures open communication. Having a clearly articulated statement about college governance structures can also prevent incursions into other entities' "territories." Continual review of these locally—and legally—defined relationships translates into a continual renewal of commitment among leaders of governance groups. Joint planning or goal-setting among these groups can further cement resolve and mutual respect for the parameters of authority and consultative power.

Should rifts between segments or factions of the faculty occur, local senate leaders must seek to bridge these schisms whenever possible. Local senates should use flex week activities or presentations before the board trustees to highlight collaborative inter- and intra-college efforts, to emphasize what is positive, encourage future cooperation, and provide the media with positive examples. It is naive to presume that wounds will heal quickly or that grievances will be forgiven. Senate leaders, however, must

[1] This article is an adaptation of an address given at the 2001 and 2002 Faculty Leadership Institutes.

LOCAL SENATES

present a professional model of decorum and reconciliation to be emulated by others.

Local senates clearly, then, must develop ongoing strategies to promote the quality of their programs and the institution. Key faculty leaders must continuously cultivate trusting relationships with legislative aides, with local officials, with influential community leaders, with foundation members, with colleagues in the K-12 and postsecondary communities—and with the press. Such efforts are of apparent benefit in times of crisis; but they also build our local reputations, or enable us to explain to the general public our need for bond issues or proposed legislation. They provide us with forums for ongoing conversations about educational and pedagogical matters often misunderstood by those outside of the academy. Some districts face a particularly daunting task in rebuilding a shattered reputation resulting from the malfeasance of trustees or college members. Rebuilding public trust in an institution cannot be done alone by a public relations officer who issues press releases; it will be accomplished by the one-on-one assurances made by those with the most enduring concern for the institution—its faculty.

Finally, as members of the local senates, we must clearly segregate acts of vengeance from those of vigilance. We must seek to prevent, after the crisis has passed, the same sort of retaliatory actions we denounced under a previous regime or on prior occasions. In taking action, we need to make the case for the skeptics within our institution and for the public outside of it; we must explain why the battles were necessary to preserve the institution as a whole.

FOR LOCAL SENATE PRESIDENTS OR OFFICERS

For a senate president—or any faculty leader—in time of crisis, we suggest these rather general truisms; however self-evident, they seem to bear repeating:

1. Take immediate stock of your own personal and professional resources. Admit your weaknesses publicly to your own small group of trusted comrades and solicit the aid of others who can do what you are not comfortable doing; now is not the time to acquire and practice new skills—you will be too busy just managing what lies before you. If others are more adept at massaging the press contacts or interpreting the budgets, let them do so. Share the burden and communicate your gratitude to them in ways they hear and feel.
2. Do not delay gratification. Give yourself permission to ignore the phone calls, to declare your household off limits, to take a trip during which you are *incommunicado*. Listen to the experts: eat right and exercise regularly. It does matter and it will enable you to endure the steady accretion of worries and details, slights, wrongs, and other generally bad news to which you will (regrettably) fall heir.
3. Understand the truism that being privy to certain kinds of information and having the counsel of those in "high places" necessarily isolates you—from friends, from your fellow officers, from the faculty at large. Regardless of the assurances of others they stand behind you, remember that they are, indeed, *behind* you, and thus it is that leaders suffer the slings and arrows. Such isolation can be the most demanding of all your burdens.
4. Cultivate and nurture interdisciplinary friendships. Retain social connections beyond the politics and continue to share books, movies, jokes, parental woes, and lunches with those who may disagree with the new political shift or who are inherently apolitical. While their retreat from the fray may easily be misconstrued as a personal affront, not all of your colleagues have the courage to participate. Be grateful for and proud of those who muster the spirit; be patient with those who do not and hold on to your previous acquaintanceships with them. Ultimately, their friendships can help you—and your institution—repair the rends.
5. Continue to think long-range, beyond today's immediate crisis, beyond your term of office, beyond this president or that chancellor or board of trustees, or those policies. You will endure, your classroom teaching will inspire, your students will matriculate, your friends will remain with you. Do the very best you can do, intellectually and morally, for the greatest number who may benefit, and then, pass the torch.

Shaaron Vogel

Vocational Faculty—What's Happening?

by Shaaron Vogel , Occupational Education Committee Chair

The purpose of this article is to highlight for occupational education faculty what is happening at the state level around vocational education.

As you all know, this budget year has not been very good for California or community colleges. While we have not suffered as much as some, we have still seen cuts in very important programs. For example, CalWORKs and matriculation funds have been cut. Many students rely on federal and state funds to attend college, particularly vocational education students. Without this funding, some students will not be able to complete or continue their education. The Academic Senate is monitoring current legislation and continues to fight to save funding for all community college programs. The Senate is also very sensitive to the funding for vocational students.

Nursing is a particularly hot subject this upcoming year. AB 2314 was signed by the Governor and is now law. This law would encourage community colleges to standardize all nursing program prerequisites statewide, encourage articulation agreements between the community college and CSU systems, and require implementation of the recommendations of the IMPAC project by September 1, 2004. This has some serious implications for community college nursing programs. The inability of small colleges to offer a full complement of prerequisites, for example, must be taken into account when addressing the issue of their standardization. Community college nursing faculty and their chairs need to attend the IMPAC meetings in large numbers and raise their voices. Community college nursing programs are very different from those at CSU and community colleges must ensure that their students' needs are addressed in IMPAC. You can find out more information about the IMPAC Project and the upcoming meeting dates by visiting the IMPAC Website at www.cal-impac.org. Please ensure that your college is represented at the regional and statewide meetings.

In June 2002 a validation study on Associate Degree Nursing Prerequisites was completed. This was done by the Center for Student Success: A Health Care Initiative Sponsored Project. The Chancellor's Office and the Academic Senate have some concerns regarding the implications of this study. This study examined the student selection measures that could be applied to improve the successful completion of ADN students in California community colleges. The goals are to increase successful program completion by reducing attrition and dropout from ADN programs and yet maintain access. The study involved 20 community college nursing programs and 5,000 students over a five year time period. The findings revealed that four factors were best predictors of student success in completing the nursing program: overall GPA, English GPA, core Biology GPA, and core Biology repetitions (the fewer the repetitions the better). The issues that develop from this study center around access and student equity and opportunity. When the selection criteria involving higher GPA requirements and fewer repetitions of core Biology courses were evaluated, it was found that the diversity of the student pool was reduced. It was found, not surprisingly, that students admitted under these selection criteria had higher success rates. However, in today's nursing world we need more diversity, NOT less, so it would seem that tightening selection criteria is not an appropriate approach for community colleges. The study was very frank in stating that it was successful in evaluating institutional factors affecting success but had great difficulty with situational factors and dispositional characteristics that affect success. The study acknowledges that further study needs to be done. The authors of the study and the Chancellor's Office agree that a multi-faceted approach needs to take place with the following goals: 1) increase numbers of nursing slots available in our programs; 2) increase outreach to recruit students into nursing; and 3) have counseling, advising, and other intervention strategies in place to help students succeed. Contact the Academic Senate for a copy of the study.

The Academic Senate has an Occupational Education Committee comprised of six to seven vocational faculty members. The committee plans breakouts for the Academic Senate plenary sessions each fall and spring as well as for the two Occupational Education Leadership conferences

offered each year. We urge you to watch your mailboxes for more information regarding these sessions and conferences. Additionally, as we begin to plan these events, please let us know what you would like to see incorporated in our planning. We want to know the hot occupational issues. Please plan to participate. We know that the faculty development funds have been cut from most budgets; however, the Occupational Education Leadership conferences cover your travel expenses, food and lodging. Your attendance is paid for, and the resources and breakouts are informative and offer an opportunity to network and connect with other occupational faculty.

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges is seeking occupational education faculty to participate on a number of statewide committees. We want to hear your voices. As you may know, this last spring a vocational faculty member was elected to the At Large position on the Executive Committee for the Academic Senate. However, one member cannot serve on the many committees at the state level where the voice of occupational education is needed. Please turn in a nomination to serve form (available on our website) if you are interested in serving.

Ian Walton

Local Senates

by Ian Walton, Relations with Local Senates Chair

The Relations with Local Senates Committee serves as a resource to local senates by assisting with local concerns related to strengthening the role of academic senates. This article provides background on some of the work of the Committee.

The Committee continues the tradition of two members from each Senate area. This year's members are:

Area A: Mike Butler (Redwoods) and Teresa Aldredge (Cosumnes River)
Area B: Kate Motoyama (San Mateo) and Cristine Ducoing (Solano)
Area C: Dorothy Williams (Antelope Valley) and Gary Morgan (Oxnard)
Area D: Terri Ann Linn Watson (Chaffey) and Mary Lee Meiners (San Diego Miramar)

Last year the Academic Senate initiated a program of visits to local academic senates. These visits were carried out by either a member of the Relations with Local Senates Committee or the Executive Committee. The purpose of the visits was to enhance the ability of the Academic Senate to provide support and advice to local senates by observing and gathering information about recent concerns and successes. The visits provided an ideal opportunity to share current information–and in some cases war stories. This year the Local Senates Committee plans to continue visits to colleges beginning with those that were not visited last year. If you are interested in having a member attend your local senates meeting soon, please contact committee chair Ian Walton at ian_walton@wvmccd.cc.ca.us to schedule a convenient time.

Over the summer the new Local Senates Handbook was published—the result of much hard work by last year's committee. The revised Handbook is a great resource for your local senate. Your local senate office should have received a paper copy but you can download your very own copy from the Senate website at: http://www.academicsenate.cc.ca.us/LocalSenates/Hb.htm. You can also contact the Senate Office for additional copies.

One of the goals of this year's Committee is to work on a Voter Registration drive to realize the promise of mobilizing students raised at the Fall 2001 Plenary Session by Brian Murphy. Each local senate president was asked to designate coordinators for the drive. If no coordinator was identified, the local senate president and vice president were designated as the drive coordinators. Recently, materials have been mailed to your local senate president and vice president as well as posted on our website. The Committee will also hold a breakout on Voter Registration at this year's Fall Session. Please join us and share your successes around registering our over 2.6 million students. We are looking forward to seeing you all there.

Leon F. Marzillier

The Accountability Game

Stanford 9 in K-12, HMO's in Health Care, ...MSLOs in CC's

by Leon F. Marzillier, Area C Representative

The increasing demand for accountability, particularly in tax-supported institutions appears to be aimed primarily at the community colleges. There is nothing intrinsically wrong with expecting accountability, but, when an activity is held up to scrutiny, we should ask ourselves: What kind of accountability is being called for? Who is demanding the accountability? Why are they demanding it? And, are the methods used to scrutinize the activity valid?

In June 2002, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) passed radical new standards by which to accredit community colleges, incorporating the idea of "continuous improvement" of "measurable student learning outcomes" (MSLOs) throughout. The ACCJC passed these new standards over the vociferous objections of respected faculty organizations. Nationally, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) has come out against modifying accreditation standards this way, and in California, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges along with the Community College Council of the California Federation of Teachers (CCC/CFT) have condemned this radical change by ACCJC. Why?

The whole concept of MSLOs as the latest fad in education is somewhat akin to the now discredited fad of the '90's, Total Quality Management, or TQM. Essentially, the ACCJC adopted MSLOs as the overarching basis for accrediting community colleges based on their faith in the theoretical treatises of a movement, just as advocates for the use of TQM in education (often called continuous quality improvement or CQI in educational circles) were part of an ideological movement. After repeated requests for research showing that such use of MSLOs is effective, none has been forthcoming from the ACCJC. Prior to large scale imposition of such a requirement at all institutions, research should be provided to establish that continuous monitoring of MSLOs has resulted in measurable improvements in student success at a given institution. No such research is forthcoming because there is none. If the "learning paradigm" is so superior as to justify its widespread adoption, then the research should clearly be compelling.

The new standards would require documentation and continuous improvement of learning outcome measures at the course, program, and certificate levels. This would require faculty and administration to measure outcomes that can be immediately documented, not long-term outcomes such as successful application of coursework in students' careers.

Also, as student learning outcomes are measures of knowledge or skills a student has attained as a result of a given college course or program, they do not include institutional measures such as course retention, completion or graduation. Community colleges in California already gather data on institutional outcomes, but this would require generation and tracking of a whole range of new measures.

Often, objections to MSLOs are met with, "But, you faculty will define what the outcomes to be measured are." This assumes that what faculty currently measure, via exams and grades are not adequate, and that faculty should spend their time generating new and much more specific skill based measures. However, no evidence has been presented establishing that the outcomes of our pedagogical efforts are not adequately measured by our current approaches, or that new measures would lead to greater student success.

In addition, much that is most beneficial in higher education is often difficult or impossible to measure—but certainly is not measurable at the course level. A business department might feel the most important outcome is that their students use what they learn in the classroom

ACCREDITATION

successfully in a career in the business world. But this is not a learning outcome that can be documented at the course or program level.

In the book, "A Beautiful Mind" about the genius, John Nash, (upon which the movie of the same name is based), the early chapters, 3,4,5,...describe how undergraduates learned at Princeton. It is illuminating in how casually many of these students acquired knowledge, and certainly not in a measurable way, but learning was effective, nevertheless. Tiger Woods has said that, even though he dropped out of Stanford in his sophomore year, he learned skills important to him in his professional golfing career, specifically in the area of time management skills. How would one measure that outcome?

It is interesting that there is suddenly this push to get "accountability" from the community colleges, the institutions that serve the most diverse and working class students, and not the same push to get it from the elite institutions, even though many universities are, like most community colleges, dependent upon taxes for their continued existence. The truth of the matter is that institutions like the Ivy League schools and top universities are not being threatened with MSLOs.

Furthermore, the MSLO movement utilizes a scorecard approach, in which you assess in percentage terms where your students are now in terms of a defined learning outcome, and how you would like to increase the percentage in 5 years, say. Then, you set as your goal the percentage improvement you want to make each semester! This requirement, that there be continuous improvement of learning outcomes, assumes that student achievement can be increasingly rationalized like a production process.

This push to document and improve student learning outcomes essentially creates pressure to focus one's course objectives on discrete, skill-based and hence most easily measured variables. Quantitative variables are more easily tracked than qualitative ones. This over time will yield to a "dumbing down" of the curriculum, as broad capacities and more long-term, qualitative changes in student behavior and perception will be relatively de-emphasized in the push to measure.

How about faculty members in art deciding that an outcome is that students have at least a rudimentary appreciation of great art and how to recognize it? How does one measure that? How does one measure a sociology department's desired outcome that their students have a more tolerant attitude towards other cultures and ethnic groups? You can probably think of more examples of the impossibility of measuring outcomes of what we do. Even if it were possible, is it realistic to expect a 2% (say) improvement per semester in any given outcome?

In the teaching and learning process, there is a two-way interaction, and there has to be cooperation and interest on both ends. Whether a student succeeds in a class is a function of not one but many factors. Some of these are: the intellectual level of the student's household, the quality of the preparation the student received in educational institutions attended before reaching ours, the priority that the student places on the class, the amount of effort a student is willing to apply outside of class, resistance to distractions from friends, family, and jobs. Many of these are beyond the instructor's or college's control. Yes, we can find new and better ways to present the material, and we can use tutors and workshops to help motivate students and to help them succeed, but those efforts alone might go for naught for some students.

Perhaps what irritates us most about the ACCJC's action, besides the fact that they chose to ignore the best advice of the practitioners in the field (the faculty), is that tying accreditation to MSLOs means that the faculty as a whole would have to spend precious time and effort to engage in measuring everything that moves on the campus, diverting our energy and efforts from interacting with students. Will our colleges receive additional funding for these efforts? We seriously doubt it! So, we are being asked to engage in what virtually amounts to a huge unfunded mandate.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 16

ACCREDITATION

THE ACADEMIC SENATE
FOR CALIFORNIA
COMMUNITY COLLEGES

President

Publications Committee

Design and Layout

The Accountability Game

BEST COPY AVAILABLE